C E MURRAY HIGH PO Box 188 Greeleyville, South Carolina 29056 7-12 High School GRADES 370 Students ENROLLMENT Dr. Peter J. Smith 843-426-2121 PRINCIPAL SUPERINTENDENT Kenneth Gardner, Ed.D. 843-355-5571 Lucille B. Scott 843-382-8303 BOARD CHAIR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ANNUAL SCHOOL 2004 REPORT CARD ABSOLUTE RATING: AVERAGE Absolute Ratings of High Schools with Students like Ours Excellent Average Below Average Unsatisfactory 0 2 4 5 3 IMPROVEMENT RATING: **EXCELLENT** ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS: Z This school met 7 out of 13 objectives. The objectives included performance and participation of students in various groups and student attendance rate. SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE GOAL By 2010, South Carolina's student achievement will be ranked in the top half of the states nationally. To achieve this goal, we must become one of the fastest improving systems in the country. FOR MORE INFORMATION, VISIT WEBSITES AT: WWW.MYSCSCHOOLS.COM WWW.SCEOC.ORG

4501012

PERFORMANCE TRENDS OVER 4-YEAR PERIOD

	Absolute Rating	Improvement Rating	Adequate Yearly Progress
2001	Unsatisfactory	Excellent	N/A
2002	Below Average	Excellent	N/A
2003	Average	Unsatisfactory	No
2004	Average	Excellent	No

DEFINITIONS OF DISTRICT RATING TERMS

- Excellent District performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- •Good District performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- •Average District performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Below Average District is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Unsatisfactory District performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

HIGH SCHOOL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (HSAP) EXAM PASSAGE RATE: SECOND YEAR STUDENTS

		Our School	l	High Schools with Students Like Ours			
Percent	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	
Passed 2 subtests	76.2	N/A	N/A	60.0	N/A	N/A	
Passed 1 subtest	11.1	N/A	N/A	19.3	N/A	N/A	
Passed no subtests	12.7	N/A	N/A	20.7	N/A	N/A	

EXIT EXAM PASSAGE RATE BY SPRING 2004

	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Percent	96.4%	86.1%

ELIGIBILITY FOR LIFE SCHOLARSHIP								
Percent of	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours						
Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at four-year institutions*	3.1	2.2						
Seniors who met the SAT/ACT requirement	3.1	2.2						
Seniors who met the grade point average	26.2	24.6						

^{*}Using only the SAT/ACT and grade point average requirements

GRADUATION RATE

	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours	
Number of Students	68	97	
Number of Diplomas	51	66	
Rate	75.0%	67.9%	

PERFORMANCE BY STUDENT GROUPS								
	Exit Exam Passage Rate by Spring 2004		Eligibility for LIFE Scholarship		Graduation Rate			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Met State Objective	
All Students	55	96.4	65	3.1	68	75.0	YES	
Gender								
Male	24	95.8	21	0.0	29	62.1	N/A	
Female	31	96.8	44	4.5	39	84.6	N/A	
Racial/Ethnic Group								
White	1	I/S	0	N/A	1	I/S	N/A	
African-American	54	96.3	65	3.1	67	76.1		
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	
Hispanic	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	
American Indian/Alaskan	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	
Racial/Ethnic Group								
Non disabled	48	97.9	60	3.3	58	84.5	N/A	
Disabilities other than speech	7	85.7	5	0.0	10	20.0	N/A	
Migrant Status								
Migrant	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	
Non-migrant	55	96.4	65	3.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	
English Proficiency								
Limited English Proficient	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	
Non-Limited English Proficient	55	96.4	65	3.1	67	76.1	N/A	
Socio-Economic Status								
Subsidized meals	45	95.6	63	3.2	58	72.4	N/A	
Full-pay meals	9	100.0	2	I/S	10	90.0	N/A	

HSAP PERFORMANCE		JUP							
	Enrollment 1st	ا اھ	% Below Basis	g /	/ ,	. / .	% Proficient and Advanced of	Performance Objective	Participation Object:
	e t	resting % Tested	, %	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced			Participation Object:
	\ \frac{16}{2} \frac{1}{2}	/ %	/ ½	/ %	1 %	1 \$	jg ig		ji
	Pa m	/ "	/ %	/	/ %	/ %	1 % A	a g	/ª 8
Englis	/ sh/Langua	ge Arts - S	<i>l</i> State Perf	ormance	/ Obiective	/			
All Students	82	81.7	16.4	32.8	35.8	14.9	59.7	YES	NO
Gender									
Male	33	78.8	34.6	26.9	23.1	15.4	46.2	N/A	N/A
Female	49	83.7	4.9	36.6	43.9	14.6	68.3	N/A	N/A
Racial/Ethnic Group									
White	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S
African-American	79	81.0	17.2	34.4	34.4	14.1	57.8	YES	NO
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	1	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	I/S
Disability Status									
Not Disabled	68	80.9	5.5	32.7	43.6	18.2	72.7	N/A	N/A
Disabled	14	85.7	66.7	33.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	I/S
Migrant Status									
Migrant	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non-Migrant	82	81.7	16.4	32.8	35.8	14.9	59.7	N/A	N/A
English Proficiency									
Limited English Proficient	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	I/S
Non-Limited English Proficient	82	81.7	16.4	32.8	35.8	14.9	59.7	N/A	N/A
Socio-Economic Status			15.0						
Subsidized meals	72	80.6	17.2	31.0	36.2	15.5	58.6	YES	NO
Full-pay meals	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathemati	cs - State	Performa	nce Obje	ctive = 30	.0%			
All Students	82	81.7	19.4	34.3	38.8	7.5	59.7	YES	NO
Gender									
Male	33	78.8	30.8	30.8	26.9	11.5	50.0	N/A	N/A
Female	49	83.7	12.2	36.6	46.3	4.9	65.9	N/A	N/A
Racial/Ethnic Group	,								
White	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S
African-American	79	81.0	20.3	34.4	37.5	7.8	57.8	YES	NO
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	1	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	I/S
Disability Status									
Not Disabled	68	80.9	5.5	38.2	47.3	9.1	72.7	N/A	N/A
Disabled	14	85.7	83.3	16.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	I/S
Migrant Status		21/2	NUA	21/2	21/2	21/2	NUA	NUA	21/4
Migrant	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non-Migrant	82	81.7	19.4	34.3	38.8	7.5	59.7	N/A	N/A
English Proficiency		h	h	h	h	h	h		
Limited English Proficient	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	I/S
Non-Limited English Proficient	82	81.7	19.4	34.3	38.8	7.5	59.7	N/A	N/A
Socio-Economic Status	70	00.0	40.0	04.5	07.0		F0.0	V50	NC
Subsidized meals	72	80.6	19.0	34.5	37.9	8.6	58.6	YES	NO
Full-pay meals	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A Not Applicable N/AV Not Available N/C Not Collected N/R Not Reported I/S Insufficient Sample

DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specifies that the statewide target is met for All Students and for the following subgroups: Racial/Ethnic, Subsidized Meals, Disability, and Limited English Proficiency.

C E Murray High				4501012
School Profile				4001012
SCHOOL PROFICE	Our School	Change from Last Year	High Schools with Students Like Ours	Median High School
Students (n= 370)				
Retention rate	13.7%	Up from 0.8%	13.7%	9.1%
Attendance rate	98.0%	Up from 96.1%	95.2%	96.0%
Eligible for gifted and talented	3.9%	Up from 3.6%	3.3%	5.8%
With disabilities other than speech	17.4%	Down from 20.3%	17.4%	12.7%
Older than usual for grade Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent &/or criminal offenses	20.0% 0.8%	Up from 19.3% Up from 0.0%	18.6% 0.8%	9.8% 1.6%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs	5.6%	Down from 13.5%	4.1%	10.2%
Successful on AP/IB exams	N/AV		10.2%	53.8%
Annual dropout rate	2.9%	Up from 2.0%	2.5%	2.7%
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	1.9%	Down from 2.8%	4.5%	3.6%
Enrollment in career/technology center courses		Up from 152	274	466
Students participating in worked-based experiences	11.1%	Down from 35.3%	22.9%	25.7%
Career/technology students mastering core competencies	62.6%	Down from 68.8%	63.4%	77.7%
Career/technology completers placed	97.1%	Down from 100.0%	97.0%	99.3%
Teachers (n= 38)				
Teachers with advanced degrees	42.1%	Up from 39.0%	47.4%	52.0%
Continuing contract teachers	78.9%	Down from 82.9%	76.0%	82.1%
Highly qualified teachers**	92.3%	N/A	85.5%	89.5%
Teachers with emergency or provisional certificates	16.7%		13.3%	8.6%
Teachers returning from previous year	87.5%	Up from 81.4%	80.0%	86.2%
Teacher attendance rate	92.9%	Down from 95.7%	94.6%	95.3%
Average teacher salary	\$39,245	Up 6.5%	\$39,755	\$41,060
Prof. development days/teacher	12.3 days	Down from 12.6 days	12.3 days	10.6 days
School				
Principal's years at school	2.0	Up from 1.0	2.0	3.0
Student-teacher ratio in core subjects	25.8 to 1	Up from 15.6 to 1	18.6 to 1	26.4 to 1
Prime instructional time	89.2%	Down from 89.9%	87.3%	90.0%
Dollars spent per pupil*	\$7,025	Up 9.5%	\$7,784	\$6,310
Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries*	61.2%	Up from 60.2%	56.8%	57.9%
Opportunities in the arts	Good	No change	Good	Excellent
Parents attending conferences	83.4%	Up from 66.2%	79.9%	89.3%
SACS accreditation	Yes	No change	Yes	Yes
Character development program * Prior year audited financial data are reported.	Average	N/A	Average	Good
10.11 10.11	1 1 44	Our District		ate
Highly qualified teachers in low poverty		N/A		.0%
Highly qualified teachers in high povert	y schools**	94.8%		.1%
		State Objective	Met State	Objective

^{**}NOTE: The verification process was not completed for the year reported; therefore the count of highly qualified teachers may not be accurate.

65.0%

95.3%

Yes

Yes

Highly qualified teachers in this school**

Student attendance in this school

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

We at C.E. Murray High School have had a successful school year. Much effort has been directed in the areas of Critical Thinking Skills, SAT Improvement, Professional Staff Development, Classroom Management, Improving Parent/Teacher communications and doing more in the area of Instructional Content to achieve academic success across the curriculum.

We have made progress; however, we realize that there are many things that we must continue to do to ensure that a quality education for all students will be our pursuit in the coming school year. We are looking forward to greater academic challenges and successes.

Danny Bryant, Chairman of SIC Dr. Peter J. Smith, Principal

EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS							
	Teachers	Students*	Parents*				
Number of surveys returned	38	89	114				
Percent satisfied with learning environment	86.5%	52.9%	72.3%				
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	81.6%	58.0%	67.0%				
Percent satisfied with home-school relations 52.6% 63.6% 73.7%							
*Only eleventh grade students and their parents were included. For schools within	out grade 11 only	the highest grade	was included				